

File name: REH1-011.pdf

CCLAS session: 01-Daisy-03_08_10

- All records have been sorted by segment time (i.e., chronologically)
- Margaret and I watched several-minute chunks of the video recording 01-Daisy-03_08_10, and then we went back through to discuss individual records.
- Time stamps in the notes below mark times in the audio recording REH1-011.wav
- A note on method: I elicited a lot of sentences here, but I did not use pictures for the elicitation: I just asked Margaret how to say different things.

Record 120 (timestamp in the CCLAS video/audio recording: 004:41.471-004:44.145)

- Daisy says <nnn wîyi chîh=pâyikush=i=u nipâwin=ihch>
- 'nnn was alone on the bed'
- Margaret says this isn't really how an adult would say it. She says it's more of a child-like way. I asked if that's because Daisy used the separate word <nipâwinihch>, and Margaret said yes (06:04 in REH1-011.wav)—but the verb that Margaret suggests is actually different and contains additional morphology.
- More adult-like target: <nnn wîyi chîh pâyikuchishkwaamishiu> 's/he slept alone' (03:15) (I censored the name with a bit of silence)
- The <wîyi> means 's/he' (7:17). Margaret says it would sound not good to omit the name and leave only the pronoun (7:52). I wonder if the <wîyi> here is actually the emphatic particle <wii>, but that's always hard to figure out. Margaret wasn't sure either.
- Margaret says you can omit the location 'in the bed', and just have the verb.
- Target for <nipâwinihch> at 6:29. Margaret confirms Daisy is not producing a possessive form.

I elicited some **related sentences/structures**:

<Peter chîh pâyikuchishkwaamishiu> or <Chîh pâyikuchishkwaamishiu Peter>
'Peter was alone in bed' (09:43, 10:07, 10:36)

Peter chîh pâyikushiu unipâwinihch
'Peter slept alone in his (own) bed' (10:55, 11:38)

Peter chîh pâyikuchishkwaamishiu John unipâwinihch
'Peter slept alone in John's bed' (13:05)

- Here the obviative possessor suffix appears before the locative.

Peter chîh pâyikuchishkwaamishiu unipâwinihch
'Peter slept alone in their bed' (John and Michael's)' (15:25, 16:56)

- This example uses a possessor that is plural and obviative. Here Margaret did not use any plural marking for the obviative possessor.
- So it's the same form of the verb and possessee as the previous example: number is neutralized for the obviative possessor.

133 (005:03.953-005:05.938)

- Daisy says <wâh mâtiwân=ish=h kiyipwâ> 'eh? i played with toys'
- Margaret says this is adult-like
- **Target:** 19:55 in REH1-011.wav
- Daisy shortens <kiyipwâ> to [kaw], which Margaret says is common in casual adult and child speech

- Daisy is shortening the word for 'toys': should be mâtiwâkinishh (19:59 in REH1-011.wav). Daisy deletes the <kin>.

I elicited some related words/structures:

- mâtiwâkinish '(little) toy' (21:37)
- mâtiwâkinishh '(little) toys' (21:25, 21:45)
- Nichiih maatiwaachaan kaa apishaashich mâtiwâkinish 'I played with a small toy'
- Nichiih maatiwaachaan kaa apishaashichh mâtiwâkinishh 'I played with small toys'
- In these examples, the main verb stays the same Conjunct verb changes form to agree with the number of 'toy/toys'

134 (005:06.755-005:08.098)

- The adult says <chi=chîh=tiḥku=n=â=u â shûshuwihkwân=ish> 'Did you take the sled?'
- Margaret confirms that 'sled' is not a possessive form.
- I elicited some related words/structures:
- shûshuwihkwânish '(little) sled' (26:50 in REH1-011.wav)
- chishûshuwihkwânish 'your (little) sled' (26:56)

135 (005:08.312-005:11.072)

- Daisy says <nimimâh tâpâ n=uhchi tiḥku=n=â=u shûshuwihkwân=ish>
- 'No, I didn't bring a sled with me (or: I didn't take a sled)'
- **Target:** 28:46, 32:40 in REH1-011.wav
- Margaret confirms this is adult-like structure.
- Margaret says Daisy omits the diminutive suffix, but I hear it.
- Margaret says Daisy is leaving out a piece of the word for 'sled'—similar to what she does with 'toy'. I think Daisy's form resembles what's in the Cree dictionary for 'slide'

154 (006:11.582-006:14.306)

- Daisy says <âi=hch chîh=îtuht=â=u> 'He went to the...'
- **Target:** 33:50 in REH1-011.wav

155 (006:15.351-006:16.971)

- Daisy says <doctor âyiht=â=yihch> 'to the doctor('s office)'
- **Target:** 34:06 in REH1-011.wav
- The Cree-only version is <nituhkuyin âyihtâiyihch> (34:11 in REH1-011.wav)
- Not a possessive, despite the translation.
- She's saying 'doctor', but it should be 'dentist'—she says that in the next record.

158 (006:22.676-006:24.337)

- Daisy says <nûtâpitâsiu=h âyiht=â=yihch> 'at the dentist's'
- **Target:** 34:49 in REH1-011.wav

160 (006:26.885-006:27.958)

- Daisy says <mâu=tiḥ iyâḥku=si=t> 'here is where it hurts'
- **Target:** 35:21, 35:27 in REH1-011.wav
- Margaret says Daisy is changing the verb, leaving off the Initial Change

163 (006:30.902-006:33.029)

- Daisy says <min=in=ikiniwi=yiuh nnn u=tiḥ> 'nnn's (teeth) were extracted here'

- **Target:** 36:49 in REH1-011.wav
- Daisy's structure isn't adult-like, Margaret says. She leaves out the word for 'his tooth', and she's changing the verb.

I elicited some related structures:

- nuutaapitaasiu chiih minipitim wiipitiyu 'The dentist pulled a tooth' (39:01)
- nuutaapitaasiu chiih minipitim wiipith 'The dentist pulled teeth' (39:21)
- nuutaapitaasiu chiih minipitimwaa Ryan wiipitiyu 'The dentist pulled Ryan's tooth' (39:27, 39:46); relational verb used here, and the -iyu on 'tooth' is for the obviative possessor.
- nuutaapitaasiu chiih minipitimwaa Ryan wiipitiyuh 'The dentist pulled Ryan's teeth' (40:01)
- Chiih minipitiniwiyuh Ryan wiipith 'Ryan's tooth was pulled' (40:26); (The passive construction is used, and no relational morphology appears. I'm having a hard time hearing what form of 'tooth' is used, whether there's a final -h or not. I'm also not sure if I'm spelling the verb correctly. Something to check with Margaret later.);
- Chiih minipitiniwiyuh Ryan wiipith 'Ryan's teeth were pulled' (40:34). (No relational form, but the plural of 'his tooth' is really clear word-final aspiration).

164 (006:36.796-006:37.592)

The adult says <châkwâ=yiu=h> 'what (things)?' (asking about what was pulled from Record 163)

At this point, I elicited lots of related structures with possession and relational forms:

First, Margaret and I did forms involving inanimate nominals *chaakwa* 'thing', *misinihîkin* 'book', and *wiikwaayaau* 'bag'

chaakwaaiyu 'thing' (42:28 in REH1-011.wav)

chaakwaaiyuh 'things' (42:36)

- the final suffix is mostly evident in the pitch shift. Margaret provides a nice minimal pair at 43:15

Ryan chiih waapihtim chaakwaaiyu
'Ryan saw something (a thing)' (43:04)

Ryan chiih waapihtim chaakwaaiyuh
'Ryan saw somethings (more than one thing)' (43:01).

Ryan chiih waapihtim uchaakwaanim
'Ryan saw his something (his thing)' (43:24, 43:55)

Ryan chiih waapihtim uchaakwaanimh
'Ryan saw his somethings (his things)' (43:57)

- Again, the stress shift is key for marking plural

Ryan chiih waapihtimwaa Sarah uchaakwaanimiyu
'Ryan saw Sarah's something (a thing)' (44:12)

- relational verb form used here

Ryan chiih waapihtimwaau Sarah uchaakwaanimiyuh
 'Ryan saw Sarah's somethings (more than one thing)' (44:23, 44:30)

- relational form used here too

Ryan chiih waapihtim misinihiikiniyu
 'Ryan saw a book' (44:51)

Ryan chiih waapihtim misinihiikinh
 'Ryan saw books' (44:58)

Ryan chiih waapihtim umisinihiikin Ryan saw his (own) book' (45:28)

- no relational form

Ryan chiih waapihtim umisinihiikinh
 'Ryan saw his (own) books' (45:37)

- no relational form

Ryan chiih waapihtimwaau Sarah umisinihiikiniyu
 'Ryan saw Sarah's book' (45:10)

Ryan chiih waapihtimwaau Sarah umisinihiikiniyuh
 'Ryan saw Sarah's books' (45:16)

Ryan chiih waapihtimwaau umisinihiikiniyu
 'Ryan saw their book' (45:58, 46:06)

- no plural marking used for the obviative possessor

Ryan chiih waapihtimwaau umisinihiikiniyuh
 'Ryan saw their books' (46:18)

- again no plural marking used for the obviative possessor

Ryan chiih waapihtim misinihiikiniyu Sarah uwiihkwaayaamihch
 'Ryan saw a book in Sarah's bag' (47:41, 48:53)

- no relational verb used here
- uwiihkwaayaamihch = u + wiihkwaayaau 'bag' + -im + -ihch

Ryan chiih waapihtim misinihiikinh Sarah uwiihkwaayaamihch
 'Ryan saw books in Sarah's bag' (47:46, 48:58)

- no relational verb here

Ryan chiih waapihtim misinihiikinh Sarah uwiihkwaayaamihch
 'Ryan saw books in Sarah's bags' (as in every bag contains multiple books) (49:35)

- no number marking for bags appears because of the locative suffix

Ryan chiih waapihtim misinihiikiniyu Sarah uwiihkwaayaamihch
 'Ryan saw a books in Sarah's bags' (as in a book tossed into a pile of bags) (51:11)

Now we moved on to forms involving animate nominal *aamuu* 'bee'

aamuu 'bee' (51:52)

Ryan chiih waapimaau aamuuh Sarah uwiihkwaayaamihch

'Ryan saw a bee in Sarah's bag' (52:03)

- This was the first, immediate form Margaret produced. It does not have the verbal morpheme -im marking the obviative object (instead it has only the transitive final -im)

Ryan chiih waapimaau aamuuh ...

'Ryan saw a bee in Sarah's bag' (52:16)

- This one was interesting. Margaret started to say this sentence, which is identical to the previous one (because 'bee' is obviative and gets no number marking).
- Margaret also noticed that this form is the same as the previous, and that made her stop for a moment. She thought about it and then produced this version, which has the verbal morpheme -im
- Ryan chiih waapimimaau aamuuh Sarah uwiihkwaayaamihch (52:35)
- Margaret also noticed the difference between <waapimaau> and <waapimimaau> (52:16) but couldn't quite put her finger on it. I'm not really sure what's happening either.

Ryan chiih waapimaau aamuuh Sarah uwiihkwaayaamihch

'Ryan saw a bee in Sarah's bags' (as in a pile of bags) (57:00)

- Again, no number marking appears with 'bag' because of the locative.

Ryan chiih waapimaau aamuuh Sarah uwiihkwaayaamihch

'Ryan saw bees in Sarah's bags' (as in a pile of bags) (57:46)

- Same structure as the previous: No number marking for 'bee' or 'bag'
- At this point, Margaret has noticed and commented many times on the differences in number marking with obviatives and with nouns taking a locative suffix. This could be a really good topic for Cree learners.

Now we do some sentences with more animate nouns, *piyaashiish* 'bird', *atim* 'dog', and *sichimaau* 'mosquito'

- Note: In some of these following examples, the prompt was in the past tense, but Margaret gave an example without the past tense preverb. The translations reflect Margaret's actual production.

piyaashiish 'bird' (58:56)

Ryan waapimaau piyaashiishh

'Ryan sees a bird' (59:01, 59:12)

- Here the obviative ending on 'bird' shows up as a pitch shift + an extended release on the fricative [j]
- *Ryan waapimaau piyaashiish (59:16) → no good because 'bird' isn't obviative

Ryan waapimaau piyaashiishh

'Ryan sees birds' (59:27)

Ryan chih waapimimaau Sarah upiyaashiishimishiyuh

'Ryan saw Sarah's bird' (59:40, 59:53)

- This one's really interesting, and Margaret even laughed after she said it at first: Lots of morphology at play.
- The verb takes the -im to indicate the obviative object 'her bird'
- The noun 'her bird' takes the possessive -im, which is then followed by the diminutive suffix -ish, which is then followed by the obviative possessor marker -iyiu

Ryan chih waapimimaau Sarah utaamiyuh

'Ryan saw Sarah's dog' (1:01:06)

- The form 'his/her dog' is particular: u- + atim 'dog' + -h = *utaamh*

Ryan chih waapimimaau Sarah utaamiyuh

'Ryan saw Sarah's dogs' (1:01:18)

- Again, Margaret commented on it being the same: No number marking for obviatives

Ryan chih waapimaau utaamh

'Ryan saw his (own) dog' (1:01:31)

- Margaret offered her judgment that no -im may be used with the verb here: * Ryan chih waapimimaau utatimh

Ryan chih waapimaau utaamh

'Ryan saw his (own) dogs' (1:01:53)

Ryan chih waapimimaau utaamiyuh

'Ryan saw their dog' (1:02:06, 1:02:26)

- This example has an obviative possessor that also has a plural referent. No number marking is used for that possessor.

Ryan chih waapimimaau utaamiyuh

'Ryan saw their dogs' (1:03:10)

- Again, no number marking is used for the obviative possessor.

Ryan chih waapimimaau upiyaashiishimishiyuh

'Ryan saw their bird' (1:02:43)

- Again, no number marking is used for the obviative possessor.

Ryan chih waapimimaau upiyaashiishimishiyuh

'Ryan saw their birds' (1:03:22)

- Again, no number marking is used for the obviative possessor.

Ryan chih waapimaau sichimaauh Sarah utaamiyihch

'Ryan saw a mosquito on Sarah's dog' (1:04:11)

- Here no verbal morpheme -im is used to mark an obviative object. Margaret produced this form immediately.
- The possessee 'her dog' takes the obviative possessor suffix before the locative suffix
- *Ryan chih waapimaau sichimaau (1:05:41), where 'mosquito' is not obviative

Ryan chih waapimaau sichimaauh Sarah utaamiyihch

'Ryan saw mosquitos on Sarah's dog' (1:06:07)

Ryan chih waapimaau sichimaauh utaamiyihch

'Ryan saw a mosquito on their dog' (1:06:31)

- Again, no number marking for the obviative possessor.

Ryan chih waapimaau sichimaauh utaamiyihch

'Ryan saw mosquitos on their dogs' (1:06:56)

- Same form as above: all the obviative elements ('their', 'mosquito', and 'dog') are all neutralized for number—Margaret also noticed this, and she found it really interesting. Again, could be a good topic for learners.

Some comments on the **vitality of Cree**:

- I asked Margaret what she finds interesting about the examples we just did, and she said it makes her think of language loss (1:07:47)
 - "We don't talk like that anymore ... the kids ... they only talk English" (1:08:05). She also notes that younger speakers "mix English and Cree a lot" (1:08:38)
 - I asked her if these kids would have receptive knowledge, if they would understand some of the examples above, and Margaret said "some of them", and she explained that some young parents don't speak Cree to their kids but that some parents still do talk Cree to their kids (1:08:49)
 - Margaret did say that some children still have adult-like abilities in Cree (1:09:16)
-

Back to discussing utterances in the Daisy recording:

Record 175 (006:58.508-007:00.298)

- Daisy says <u=tâh â ihtut=im door=h> 'Is he doing this to the door?'
- Categorizing English nouns by animacy: Daisy does categorize English "door" as animate, because Margaret says Daisy correctly produces a final animate obviative -h on "door" (1:15:39 in REH1-011.wav). It's impossible to know if she's producing the question -h and actually not marking the noun as obviative, but I will give Daisy the benefit of the doubt.
- This means Daisy commits a particular error in this record: Margaret says Daisy uses the verb that takes an inanimate object, but the Cree word *chishtuhkin* 'door' is animate. The more adult-like verb would be <ihtutiwaau>.
- A comparable example with an inanimate noun and inanimate transitive verb: <utâh â ihtutim book-iyiu> or <utâh â ihtutim misinihiikiniyiu> (1:15:09) → both use obviative suffix with object
- **Cree-only adult target:** <u=tâh â ihtutiwaau chishtuhkin> 1:12:37, 1:16:46 in REH1-011.wav

177 (007:03.028-007:04.865)

- Daisy says <u=tâh â ihtut=im=∅ ani=yâh> 'Is he doing like this to them?'
- **Target:** 1:18:09 in REH1-011.wav
- I hear a strong final -h here on <ani=yâh>, and Margaret confirms that Daisy produces an -h on <ani=yâh>
- Margaret says verb and DEM match in animacy, so <ani=yâh> must refer to 'them' (inanimate)
- If the object were singular, it would be <u=tâh â ihtut=im=∅ ani=yâ> (1:21:06). Nice minimal pair there.

Here I elicited some examples related to **inanimate nouns and demonstratives**:

asinii 'rock' (1:21:40)

nichiih tihchishkaan an asinii
'I kicked that rock' (1:21:47)

nichiih tihchishkaan anihii asiniih
'I kicked those rocks' (1:22:05)

nichiih tihchishkaan an
'I kicked that (rock)' (1:22:44)

nichiih tihchishkaan anihii
'I kicked those (rocks)' (1:22:46)

Chiih tihchishkim aniyaa asiniiyu
'He kicks that rock' (1:22:57)

Chiih tihchishkim aniyaah asiniih
'He kicks that rock' (1:23:21)

Chiih tihchishkim aniyaa
'He kicks that (rock)' (1:23:42)

Chiih tihchishkim aniyaah
'He kicks those (rocks)' (1:23:50)

Record 191 (007:35.389-007:37.525)

- Daisy says <mâu=tih wî u=hî nimâ> 'These go here, right?'
- **Target:** 1:25:05 in REH1-011.wav
- Adult-like utterance

194 (007:39.986-007:41.631)

- Daisy says <chîshtihîkin=h> 'forks'
- **Target:** 1:25:30 in REH1-011.wav
- For comparison: chîshtihîkin 'fork' (1:25:46) vs. chîshtihîkin=h 'forks' (1:25:47)
- Margaret confirms that Daisy produces the final -h

196 (007:42.205-007:43.239)

- Daisy says <pitâtis=h wî u=hî> 'these are potatoes'
- She cuts herself off during <u=hî>, but I think the [h] is evident so she was going to say <u=hî>
- A minimal pair, for comparison (1:27:35, 1:27:51 in REH1-011.wav): pitâtis 'potato' (1:27:21) vs. pitâtis-h 'potatoes' (1:27:24).
- To me, these sound almost identical—maybe an example of a lexical item where the addition of final -h makes very little phonetic difference? I think the phonetic difference is that the fricative [s] is lengthened for the version with final /h/ added.
- I asked if this is hard for learners too, and Margaret said yes (1:28:00)

- pitâtis uu 'This is a potato' (1:28:32)
- pitâtis=h uhii 'These are potatoes' (1:28:38)
- Margaret said "I think I'm gonna start teaching like that", because they also have difficulty perceiving final -h (1:28:51). I floated the idea of working together to make a list of words with and without final -h, as a tool for students. Maybe a future project there.

197 (007:43.494-007:44.464)

- Daisy says <âi ây=â=kiniwi=ch-h> 'ah ... to ... these'
- **Target:** 1:33:28 in REH1-011.wav
- She's trying to say something for peeling potatoes.
- Originally, records 197 and 198 were a bit mixed up, with <mâu=hî > put in 197, so Margaret and I fixed that.

198 (007:44.424-007:46.526)

- Daisy says <mâu=hî mûhkumân> 'here are the ... knife'
- **Target:** 1:36:26 in REH1-011.wav
- She's talking about the knives for peeling potatoes
- For comparison: <mâu mûhkumân> 'here is the knife' (1:36:32)
- Daisy's intonation indicates she's saying something like 'here are ...' with a pause, and then starts labeling individual knives with the noun 'knife'

200 (007:48.819-007:49.858)

- Daisy says <mûhkumân> 'knife'
- Daisy says [mukəmænsə], but Margaret says the [sə] is not the English plural /s/
- Still labeling individual knives

203 (007:53.535-007:56.025)

- Daisy's trying to say <mâu=tâh minihkwâkin=h> 'like this, cups'
- **Target:** 1:42:55 in REH1-011.wav
- Minimal pair, for comparison: <minihkwâkin> 'cup' vs. <minihkwâkinh> 'cups' (1:43:02)
- Margaret confirms that Daisy produces the final plural -h on 'cup'

244 (009:31.438-009:33.716)

- Daisy says <mâu=tih wî âmihkwân=ish=ich nimâ> 'The little spoons go in here, right?'
- **Target:** 01:44:38, 1:45:09 in REH1-011.wav

258 (010:06.801-010:08.669)

- Daisy says <kush=t=â=u â ani=yâh nnn=sh> 'is little nnn scared of him? (Does nnn fear him?)'
- **Target:** 1:46:17 in REH1-011.wav
- Margaret confirms that Daisy uses the demonstrative form <ani=yâh>, but she says an adult would use <kushtâu â aniyâyuih nnn=sh>, with a different variant of the demonstrative (1:46:48). The usage of <ani=yâh> here is not quite adult-like.

259 (010:09.203-010:10.343)

- The adult says <awâ=yuih mâk ani=yâyuih> 'who is that person then?'
- Margaret confirms that the adult said <ani=yâyuih> not <ani=yâh> (1:48:27 in REH1-011.wav)

- I asked Margaret about using the variant form of the demonstrative <aniyâh> here (1:48:32): She says <awâyuh mâk aniyâh> is possible but not as good. Maybe something is less preferable about using <aniyâh> utterance finally, or at least in certain syntactic positions?